

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The examiner notes in item 2 on page 2 of the office action that claim 8 is withdrawn from consideration. Claim 8 has now been cancelled.

The examiner has objected to figures 2A and 2B because they do not contain the legend "Prior Art". Accordingly, applicant submits a replacement sheet for figures 2A and 2B which now include the appropriate legend "Prior Art" as required by the examiner.

The examiner has also objected to the drawings because there is an extra drawing sheet which is not labeled with a figure number and which is not described in the specification. In response to this objection the aforementioned extra drawing sheet has been cancelled. Accordingly there is no need to provide a description of this drawing in the specification.

The examiner has objected to the abstract because the phrase "Disclosed is" should not be included and the term "said" should be deleted from lines 5 and 8. In response to this objection, applicant has complied with the examiner's suggestions for amending the abstract.

The examiner has objected to the title in item 7 of the office action and suggests that the title should be "process of making splittable microfiber substrate". Applicant has amended the title in accordance with the examiner's suggestion.

The examiner has rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In rejecting the claim the examiner notes that the Markush language

which immediately precedes the phrase “polyester (B) having low crystallization . . .” is improper. In response to this rejection applicant has deleted the aforementioned Markush language. The relevant portion of claim 3 now reads “polyester (B) can be one or more than one polyester (B) having low crystallization . . .”. It is to be noted that although the term “polyester (B) is singular, the term “polyester” is generic to a group of compounds known as “polyesters”. Thus, claim 3 properly recites that polyester (B) can be “one or more than one polyester (B)”.

Also in rejecting claim 3, the examiner notes that the term “consisting” in lines 5 and 8 should be inserted after the word “group”. Applicant has complied with the examiner’s suggestion.


Applicant has also changed the phrase “one and more than one glycolic acid” so that it now reads “one or more than one glycolic acid” in claim 3. Likewise applicant has changed the phrase “one and more than one glycol” in claim 3 so that it now reads “one or more than one glycol”.

In view of the present amendment and the examiner’s indication that claims 1, 2 and 4-7 are allowable and the examiner’s indication of allowable subject matter with respect to claim 3, applicant submits that all of the claims which are currently pending in the application are now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 8, 2003

BACON & THOMAS
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Phone: (703) 683-0500


Joseph DeBenedictis
Registration No. 28,502

Serial No. 09/917,946

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please cancel the unlabelled photographic drawing found on page 11 of the originally submitted application.

The attached sheet of drawing includes changes to figures 2A and 2B. This sheet replaces the original sheet of figures 2A and 2B. In figures 2A and 2B, the appropriate legend "Prior Art" has been added.

Attachments:

Replacement sheet for figures 2A and 2B

Annotated sheet showing changes to figures 2A and 2B